Amdt. dated January 25, 2008

Reply to Advisory Action of December 14, 2007

#### REMARKS

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 were pending in the application at the time of the advisory action. Various combinations of Claims 1 and 30 to 57 remain rejected for nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting. Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 remain rejected as anticipated.

While Applicants disagree with the Office's position on the interpretation of the MPEP and note that it renders portions of the MPEP moot, Applicants are attempting to obtain copies of the references at issue as they were not included with the files that were transferred to Applicants' attorney. If Applicants are successful, the references will be submitted when they are obtained. Applicants further note that this should be unnecessary because the USPTO should have the necessary information in the parent file.

Obviousness-Type Double-Patenting Rejections

The obviousness-double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,823,520

Claims 30, 47, 51, 53, and 57 stand rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view Claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,823,520. Enclosed herein is a Terminal Disclaimer executed by the Assignee of this application and the patent and the appropriate fee. Applicants respectfully submit that this renders the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 30, 47, 51, 53, and 57 in view of Claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,823,520.

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P. Garden West Office Plaza 1900 Garden Road, Suite 220 Monterey, CA 93940 (831) 655-0880 Fax (831) 655-0888

Amdt. dated January 25, 2008

Reply to Advisory Action of December 14, 2007

# The obviousness-double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,907,608

Claims 30, 47, 51, 53, and 57 stand rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view Claims 1 to 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,608. Enclosed herein is a Terminal Disclaimer executed by the Assignee of this application and the patent and the appropriate fee. Applicants respectfully submit that this renders the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 30, 47, 51, 53, and 57 in view Claims 1 to 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,608.

## The obviousness-double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,835

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 stand rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,835. Enclosed herein is a Terminal Disclaimer executed by the Assignee of this application and the patent and the appropriate fee. Applicants respectfully submit that this renders the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 30, 47, 51, 53, and 57 in view Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,835.

### The provisional obviousness-double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/995,926

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 stand provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/995,926. Claims 1 and 23 to 50

Amdt. dated January 25, 2008

Reply to Advisory Action of December 14, 2007

of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/995,926. Enclosed herein is a Terminal Disclaimer executed by the Assignee of both applications. Applicants respectfully submit that this renders the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 in view of Claims 1 and 23 to 50 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/995,926.

## The provisional obviousness-double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/996,266

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 stand provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view Enclosed herein is a Terminal Disclaimer executed by the Assignee of both applications. Applicants respectfully submit that this renders the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 in view Claims 1 and 30 to 57 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/996,266.

#### § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(b) as being anticipated by WIPO Patent Publication No. W/O 97/06516, hereinafter referred to as De Jong. To move the prosecution forward in view of the comments in the Advisory Action, Applicants have amended Claims 30, 43, 47, 51, 53 and 57 to recite that the contexts, context barriers, and entry objects are all in a runtime environment that includes an operating system and that each of these elements are not

Amdt. dated January 25, 2008

Reply to Advisory Action of December 14, 2007

included in the operating system. The amendments are supported at least by Fig. 7 and Fig. 12 and the descriptions thereof.

Storing information with the data and enforcing the access conditions for that data by the operating system is fundamentally different from the entry point object and context barrier in each of Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57, which are at a different level than the operating system and so provide a new level of functionality that is neither taught nor suggested by De Jong. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57.

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 remain in the application.
Claims 30, 43, 47, 51, 53 and 57 have been amended. Claims 1
to 29, 52 and 54 to 56 were canceled previously. For the
foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance
of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions
relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested
to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 25, 2008.

Attorney for Applicant(s)

January 25, 2008
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Forrest Gunnison

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 32,899

Tel.: (831) 655-0880